

INDIANA MULTI-  
JURISDICTIONAL  
DRUG TASK FORCES,  
2002 AND 2003

# INDIANA MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES, 2002 AND 2003

Samuel Nunn  
Kenna Quinet  
William Newby

Susan Burow  
Database Development



© 2005 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment 05-C12  
342 North Senate Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708





# INDIANA MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES, 2002 AND 2003

June 2005

05-C12

## Authors

Samuel Nunn  
Kenna Quinet  
William Newby

Susan Burow  
*Database Development*

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction .....	3
Describing Indiana's Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces, 2002 & 2003.....	5
MJTFs at work in the state of Indiana, 2002-2003.....	6
MJTF cost during the 2002 and 2003 operating periods .....	10
MJTF production during the 2002 and 2003 periods.....	14
Arrests, convictions, and cases .....	14
Drugs seized and methamphetamine labs dismantled .....	22
Assets seized and forfeited .....	29
Appendix 1 Multi-jurisdictional Task Forces in Indiana, 2002-2003 .....	33
Appendix 2 Multi-jurisdictional Drug Task Force Performance Report Form .....	37



## Index of Tables

Table 1: Number of Different Agencies Working with MJTFs .....	7
Table 2a: Number of Personnel with Full-Time Commitment .....	8
Table 2b: Number of Personnel with Part-Time Commitment.....	9
Table 3: Funds Allocated During 2002 and 2003 for Individual Task Forces.....	11
Table 4: Federal, Local, and Minimum Total Expenditures .....	12
Table 5: Fund Breakdown by Source of Funds 2002 and 2003.....	13
Table 6: Drugs of Primary Focus as Identified by Task Forces.....	15
Table 7: Total Arrests and Convictions by Type of Offense .....	16
Table 8: Total Number of Persons Arrested by Demographics .....	17
Table 9: Total Number of Persons Arrested in 2002 and 2003, by Demographic Characteristics .....	18
Table 10: Number of Arrests by Offense Type by MJTF by Year.....	19
Table 11: Number of Convictions by Offense Type by MJTF by Year.....	20
Table 12: Total Drug Arrests by Type of Drug by Year .....	21
Table 13: Total Case Investigations and Outcomes.....	22
Table 14: Number of Cases Carried Over, New Cases, and Cases Completed by MJTF by Year .....	23
Table 15: Total Quantities of Drug Seizures by Type of Drug by Year .....	25
Table 16: Total Number of Meth Labs Dismantled.....	25
Table 16a: Number of Meth Labs Dismantled by MJTF by Year.....	26
Table 16b: Number of Meth labs Dismantled by MJTF, by Year, and with Indiana State Police Assistance .....	27
Table 17: Total Number of Assets Seized and Forfeited and Values by Asset Category by Year.....	30
Table 18: Number and Value of Assets Seized and Forfeited by MJTF by Year .....	31



# Executive Summary

In 2002 and 2003, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) administered federally-funded grants to 35 multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTF) that primarily provided drug enforcement services to surrounding county and local police and prosecution agencies. These 35 MJTFs worked with or provided coordinated drug enforcement services to perhaps 200 or so other agencies throughout the state. The most complete source of information describing the composition and productive activities of MJTFs is maintained by ICJI. Each task force has been required to submit regular financial and performance reports to ICJI staff, which have been maintained in hard-copy format within ICJI's filing system archives. These performance reports are based on a questionnaire designed by ICJI staff. The large number of separate files (approximately 550 "packets" of information) posed a major challenge to any systematic description of the operations of Indiana MJTFs, much less any future possible analyses or evaluations. Beginning in fall 2004, the Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) converted these hard copy files into an electronic relational data base. Based on the data base that was developed, this report offers a descriptive analysis of the 35 MJTFs at work within the state during the calendar years 2002 and 2003.

This report essentially addresses three questions for the years 2002 and 2003. First, what was the general composition of Indiana MJTFs? Second, what were the estimated expenditures of the 35 task forces—that is, what did they cost and where did the funds originate? Third, what outputs and outcomes were “produced” by the MJTFs? In using the existing ICJI file archive of MJTF reports to answer these questions, it might be expected that the 35 MJTFs in Indiana would report considerable variation in expenditures, the composition of their expenditure stream, and the final outputs and outcomes produced by each task force. Significantly, this includes variation in the information each MJTF reports to ICJI for each year that grants are awarded. Some MJTFs have not submitted reports, and in many reports that are submitted, some information is not included. Nonetheless, some broad characterization of MJTFs and their productive activity in 2002 and 2003 was possible.

The MJTFs are composed primarily of law enforcement personnel, consisting of approximately 200 full-time sworn personnel, and a much smaller number of prosecutors and other civilian personnel. These MJTFs expended an estimated \$8 million annually in 2002 and 2003. The source of approximately half of this amount comes from federal grant awards. The remainder comes from a combination of local funds, including proceeds from the sale of assets forfeited by drug offenders.

Given these investments in MJTFs, the task forces produced a variety of outputs and outcomes. Indiana MJTFs were involved in approximately 14,000 arrests during these two years, mostly for possession or distribution of illegal substances. The typical arrestee was an adult white male. The MJTFs initiated approximately 7,000 to 8,000 new cases in each of the two years. Combining 2002 and 2003, prosecution activity associated with MJTFs resulted in just under 4,200 convictions. From their arrest activities, Indiana MJTFs seized more than 130,000 “dosage units” of illegal drugs, as well as more than 11,000 kilograms of illegal substances. More than 1,200 methamphetamine labs were dismantled. For this two-year period, MJTFs seized assets valued at approximately \$8.6 million. MJTFs netted a total of nearly \$3.8 million in local income from those assets actually forfeited in 2002 and 2003.





# Introduction

Multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTF) have been funded by the U.S. National Institute of Justice Byrne grant programs since the late 1980s, primarily as components of drug enforcement policy. By 2003, the Byrne grant program was providing funds to approximately 35 MJTFs throughout the state of Indiana. The various MJTFs, along with the counties and cities of operation, are shown in Appendix 1. These MJTFs provide drug enforcement services to approximately 50 of 92 Indiana counties and approximately 47 other local jurisdictions, including information for at least nine metropolitan centers (Evansville, Fort Wayne, Gary, Indianapolis, Kokomo, Lafayette, Muncie, South Bend and Terre Haute). Although the Byrne grants dedicated to MJTFs have a fairly long history in Indiana, there have been few analyses of MJTF activities. Other than two short annual reports in 1989 and 1990, and a longer analysis of two MJTFs in 1991, there have been no systematic data analyses describing (nor evaluations of) Indiana MJTFs.<sup>1</sup>

In response, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) expressed the need for a description of the activities of the various state MJTFs. One challenge to mounting this description was that all reports submitted to ICJI by each MJTF were in manual, hard-copy format, and had never been converted to a form (e.g., electronic data bases) that permitted efficient descriptions of MJTF activities followed by evaluation or analysis of MJTF performance. Therefore, the first step in any effort to evaluate the contributions of different MJTFs throughout the state was the creation of an aggregated data base to describe the activities of MJTFs. This data base would be comprised of regular quarterly and six month reports that have been submitted by MJTFs to ICJI. These report forms, in hard-copy format, have been provided to ICJI as a primary means of monitoring Byrne grant funds allocated to each task force. Guidance for reporting was provided by ICJI to MJTFs in the form of a detailed 12-page questionnaire.

ICJI needed these numerous hard-copy forms to be transformed into digital files to enable further future analysis. Working with ICJI staff, researchers from the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis designed an electronic data base which was then populated by performance and application data reported by Indiana MJTFs for the calendar years 2002 and 2003.

Reports submitted by MJTFs to ICJI are based on a questionnaire form designed by ICJI. A copy of that form is included in Appendix 2 of this report. The report requires detail on 29 separate information components, itemized across 12 pages. Based on the inventory of regular reports filed by MJTFs and maintained at ICJI, Center researchers assembled all MJTF applications, performance and fiscal reports submitted to ICJI for 2002 and 2003 that described task force personnel, participating agencies, case investigations and outcomes, drugs seized and purchased, drug labs dismantled, numbers of cases, type and value of assets seized or forfeited, arrests, charges filed, and convictions. There is some limited demographic information included in performance reports and funding applications for arrests, charges filed, and convictions. In addition, Center researchers performed a simple coding of the narrative MJTF

---

<sup>1</sup> See Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information, *Multijurisdictional Drug Task Forces: An Enforcement Approach to Drugs in Indiana*, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, December 1989. Also see McGarrell, E.F. and K. Schlegel, *An Evaluation of the South Central Indiana and Tri-County Narcotics Task Forces*, Center for Criminal Justice Research and Information, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, February 1991.





problem statements and task force goals included in the reports.<sup>2</sup> The objective was to create an effective and relatively efficient data base capable of supporting some basic descriptions of MJTF organization and activity.

The primary sources of information were the Byrne grant applications, ICJI performance reports, and financial history reports filed by the Indiana MJTFs for 2002 and 2003. In total, this made up a sizeable number of hard-copy reports. By the time all information had been reviewed and coded—including MJTF grant applications, performance reports filed with ICJI, and all quarterly and final financial reports—approximately 550 separate document packages were examined. The Center coded the data from those reports into electronic files using the Microsoft Access 2003 relational data base program. Based on a series of meetings and discussions between ICJI staff and Center staff, the following tasks and data items comprised the bulk of work:

1. Assembled data submitted from MJTFs to ICJI for 2002 and 2003.
  - 1.1. All MJTF applications
  - 1.2. Periodic performance reports
  - 1.3. Financial reports
2. Based on a review of all data sources, designed an Access data base that would be populated by the MJTF data.
3. Reviewed the data base design and structure with ICJI staff, and made the appropriate modifications based on that review.
4. Coded the appropriate data, creating an inventory of task force descriptors, generally consisting of:
  - 4.1. Goals & objectives
  - 4.2. Personnel: how many, functions positions
  - 4.3. Participating agencies
  - 4.4. Case investigations and outcomes
  - 4.5. Drugs seized and purchased
  - 4.6. Drug labs dismantled
  - 4.7. Numbers of cases
  - 4.8. Type and value of assets seized and forfeited
  - 4.9. Arrests
  - 4.10. Charges filed
  - 4.11. Convictions
  - 4.12. Annual expenditures
  - 4.13. Project income (e.g., asset forfeiture sales), if included in financial reports
5. Assembled demographic information included in performance reports and funding applications.
  - 5.1. Arrests
  - 5.2. Charges filed
  - 5.3. Convictions
6. Analyzed all assembled information to build a basic description of MJTFs.

---

<sup>2</sup> The problem statements and goal/objective listings submitted each year by the Indiana MJTFs are not included or discussed in this report.



# Describing Indiana's Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces, 2002 & 2003

In reviewing Indiana's 35 MJTFs, several limitations should be noted regarding the completeness and quality of the information contained in the MJTF performance reports. Other than some of the financial reports, all of the MJTF applications or performance reports for 2002 and 2003 were maintained as hard copies in the ICJI filing system. As will be shown, some files for MJTFs were incomplete or missing, although every effort was made to locate all available files. Even so, there were cases of missing data for some MJTFs. In addition to missing data, there were other issues that limited how the MJTF descriptive analysis should be interpreted. These are noted below.

First, the reports included in the ICJI files that were reviewed and converted into electronic files did not describe all two years of activities of all MJTFs in operation. For example, there were either one or both reports missing for 2002 and for 2003 for five task forces. Thus, the information contained in some of the tables are likely to be markedly different from what it would have been with the inclusion of this additional data.

Second, the MJTFs varied in terms of how complete the reports were that were included in the ICJI files. So, regarding the "completion rate" percentages found in each table, completeness was affirmed if task forces completed any part of a given section. For example, in the number of different agencies working with MJTFs table, task forces were given credit for completing the section even if they only listed local agencies and not other agencies as well. If task forces failed to complete any part of a section, an N/R (not reported) was entered in that table for the respective task force.

Third, some MJTFs submitted information in forms or ways that differed from what was requested in the ICJI report forms. For instance, information that was requested by the ICJI questionnaire was occasionally consolidated by grantees. That is, rather than providing individual figures for each type of question, one combined figure was sometimes provided. Consequently, when this happened, a degree of specificity was sometimes sacrificed.

Fourth, the frequent use of the "other" category in many questions ultimately meant that the recounting of many responses lost some detail. The "other" option was available to task forces on most questions and one that was frequently selected by task forces. Most "other" options included a line where task forces could specify what they meant by "other." However, most task forces did not complete the "other" specification line.

Fifth, regarding statistics on methamphetamine labs, there is a potential for double reporting between the Indiana State Police (ISP) and the remaining 34 task forces. For example, the ISP reported dismantling 697 methamphetamine labs in 2002 while the remaining 34 task forces reported dismantling 460 combined. These statistics are not mutually exclusive--there is significant overlap between these figures as the ISP works with other task forces to dismantle methamphetamine labs.

Sixth, considering the substantial number of items reported within the ICJI report forms by the various MJTFs, conviction data were among the most poorly reported data in the performance reports. Some task forces stated that conviction data were maintained by the prosecutor's office. In addition, convictions



often do not immediately follow arrests, which can result in reporting lags. Given these circumstances, comparisons between arrests and convictions are difficult and should be made with caution.

Finally, qualifiers for each individual table are also provided in the table notes, and vary from table to table depending on the information item being reported. The remainder of this descriptive report summarizes the findings drawn from the ICJI reports filed by MJTFs in Indiana.

## **MJTFs at work in the state of Indiana, 2002-2003**

***Number of different agencies working with MJTFs (Table 1).*** As befits their cross-jurisdictional character, MJTFs work with both local and other county, state, or federal agencies to perform their missions. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported the number of agencies on their task force for 2002 and 89 percent (31/35) reported this information for 2003. In addition to their local working relationships, MJTFs report working with up to a dozen other agencies during 2002 and 2003. On average, in both 2002 and 2003, MJTFs worked with about five other agencies.

***Number of personnel with full-time commitment (Table 2a).*** Indiana MJTFs are dominated largely by law enforcement personnel, although some task forces have a limited number of prosecution or other personnel (e.g., administrative support staff). Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported information on the number of personnel with full-time commitment for 2002 and 86 percent (30/35) reported this information for 2003. Eleven of the MJTFs reflect regular non-reporting habits regarding the full-time personnel commitment. Notably, three task forces reported having no full-time law enforcement personnel in 2002 and three task forces reported having no full-time law enforcement personnel in 2003. It is clear that the organizational structure of MJTFs varies across the state.

As illustrated in Table 2a, law enforcement personnel constitute the majority of task forces' full-time personnel, followed by other personnel (legal, financial, administrative) and prosecution personnel. Furthermore, there appears to be little variation in the number of full-time law enforcement, prosecution, and other personnel from 2002 to 2003.

***Number of personnel with part-time commitment (Table 2b).*** In addition to personnel with full-time commitment, task forces are asked to report the number of personnel with part-time commitment working with their task forces. While the completion rate does not change—as task forces received credit for completing the personnel section if they completed any part of the personnel section, full-time or part-time—the number of task forces who reported having part-time personnel differs. With this caveat in mind, of the 35 task forces, 34 percent (12/35) reported having part-time personnel in 2002 and 34 percent (12/35) reported having part-time personnel in 2003.

As illustrated in Table 2b, law enforcement personnel constitute the greatest number of task forces' part-time personnel, followed by prosecution personnel, administrative personnel, financial personnel, and legal personnel. Furthermore, as with Table 2a, there appears to be little variation in the number of different types of part-time personnel from 2002 to 2003.



**Table 1: Number of Different Agencies Working with MJTFs <sup>1</sup>**

Task Force Name	Local Agencies <sup>2</sup>		Other Agencies <sup>3</sup>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	10	8
Anderson Police Department	1	1	9	8
Auburn Police Department	1	1	4	5
Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	3	1
Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	10	10
Clinton County Drug Task Force	1	1	1	2
Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	1	1
Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	6	6
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	0	N/R	6
Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	N/R	7	N/R
Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	1	1	3	3
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	4	4
Howard County Prosecutor	1	1	4	3
Indiana State Police Drug Task Force	1	N/R	8	N/R
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	1	1	3	11
Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	4	3
Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	3	4
Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	9	9
LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	1	1	10	8
Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	N/R	1	N/R	9
Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	1	1	2	6
Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	4	4
Peru Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	2	3
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	6	4
South Central Narcotics Task Force	1	1	8	4
St. Joseph County Drug Task Force	1	1	12	12
Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	4	4
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	1	1	5	5
Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force	1	1	8	7
Vigo County Drug Task Force	1	1	8	9
Warren County Drug Task Force	N/R	1	N/R	2
Wayne County Drug Task Force	N/R	0	N/R	2
White/Carroll County Drug Task Force	1	1	1	5
Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	1	N/R	3	N/R
Total	29	28	162	168

N/R represents no information reported on agencies working with the task forces.

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported the number of agencies on their task force for 2002, and 89% (31/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Local agencies was a yes/no response with 1 indicating having worked with local agencies and 0 indicating not having worked with local agencies.

<sup>3</sup> The category 'other agencies' consists of non-local agencies that the task forces worked with during the reporting period. As such, these numbers reflect the *number* of different other agencies the task forces worked with rather than a yes/no response.



**Table 2a: Number of Personnel with Full-Time Commitment <sup>1</sup>**

Task Force Name	Number of Law Enforcement Personnel		Number of Prosecution Personnel		Number of Other Personnel (legal, financial, administrative)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	7	7	0	0	2	1
Anderson Police Department	5	5	0	0	0	0
Auburn Police Department	6	6	0	0	0	0
Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force	2	N/R	0	N/R	2	N/R
Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force	11	11	2	0	1	1
Clinton County Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force	5	5	0	0	0	0
Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force	9	9	0	0	1	1
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	9	N/R	0	N/R	1
Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force	N/R	6	N/R	1	N/R	2
Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	5	5	1	1	1	1
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	4	5	0	0	0	0
Howard County Prosecutor	0	0	0	3	2	2
Indiana State Police Drug Task Force	45	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	10	7	0	2	1	0
Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	10	8	0	0	2	2
Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	4	5	0	0	0	0
Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	11	15	0	0	4	4
LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	11	11	0	0	1	1
Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	14	N/R	1	N/R	1	N/R
Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	3	2	0	0	0	0
Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force	10	10	0	0	1	1
Peru Police Department Drug Task Force	3	3	0	0	0	0
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force	4	5	0	0	0	1
South Central Narcotics Task Force	0	0	0	0	1	1
St. Joseph County Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	2	2
Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	6	6	3	3	0	0
Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force	2	19	3	4	2	2
Vigo County Drug Task Force	7	7	0	0	0	0
Warren County Drug Task Force	N/R	2	N/R	0	N/R	0
Wayne County Drug Task Force	N/R	4	N/R	0	N/R	1
White/Carroll County Drug Task Force	2	1	0	0	0	0
Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	2	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R
Total	199	174	10	14	24	24

N/R represents non-completion of the entire personnel section for a given year.

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported information on the number of personnel with full-time commitment for 2002, and 86% (30/35) reported this information for 2003.



**Table 2b: Number of Personnel with Part-Time Commitment <sup>1</sup>**

Task Force Name	Number of Law Enforcement Personnel		Number of Prosecution Personnel		Number of Other personnel (legal, financial, administrative)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anderson Police Department	0	0	0	0	2	2
Auburn Police Department	0	0	0	0	4	0
Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force	0	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R
Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force	2	2	0	0	0	0
Clinton County Drug Task Force	8	8	0	0	2	2
Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	0
Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	0
Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard County Prosecutor	0	0	6	6	0	0
Indiana State Police Drug Task Force	0	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	3	0	0	0	0	2
Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	1	1	0	0
LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	4	2
Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	0	N/R	2	N/R	0	N/R
Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	2	2
Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peru Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	2	0	0	0	0
South Central Narcotics Task Force	0	0	2	2	2	2
St. Joseph County Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vigo County Drug Task Force	2	4	1	2	0	0
Warren County Drug Task Force	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	0
Wayne County Drug Task Force	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	0
White/Carroll County Drug Task Force	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	0	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R
Total	15	16	12	12	16	12

N/R represents non-completion of the entire personnel section for a given year.

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported information on the number of personnel with full-time commitment for 2002, and 86% (30/35) reported this information for 2003.



## MJTF cost during the 2002 and 2003 operating periods

Based on the financial reports submitted to ICJI from the various MJTFs, funds used for MJTF operations come from several sources. These include federal grant awards (i.e., Byrne funds), local (or in the case of the Indiana State Police, state) matches to these funds, proceeds from asset forfeitures (i.e., sale of assets seized), and other local income that might accrue to an MJTF. As shown in the following tables, the amounts of and relationships between these various sources vary considerably among the 35 MJTFs.

***Funds allocated during 2002 and 2003 for MJTFs (Table 3).*** Based on the reports submitted by MJTFs to ICJI, the task forces spent approximately \$6.4 million annually from all funding sources in 2002 and about the same amount again in 2003. Of the 35 task forces, 100 percent (35/35) reported funds allocated information for 2002 and 97 percent (34/35) reported this information for 2003. However, the following caveats should be taken into consideration when reviewing the financial information contained in the reports archived at ICJI. First, the “minimum total expenditures” consisted of federal grant awards, and state and local matches spent. These figures represented what should be considered the minimum that task forces spent during a reporting period. Second, total expenditure including project income consists of federal, state, and local matches spent, and project income expended. Because the financial reporting contents of the various MJTF reports were not always clear regarding sources and uses of funds, total expenditures may include some double counting as the project income expenditure could have been used as a local match. Furthermore, neither of these figures—minimum total expenditure and total expenditure including project income—includes forfeitures obtained within a project period, which could have been used as a funding source.

The largest MJTF expenditures occurred in perhaps predictable locales. Focusing on minimum total expenditures in 2003, for example, only four of the MJTFs—the Marion County METRO Drug Task Force, the Indiana State Police, the Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force, and the Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force—accounted for 44 percent of minimum total expenditures. On average in 2003, an MJTF spent approximately \$185,000 although the range of expenditures varied from \$21,000 to more than \$1 million.

***Fund breakdown by source of funds 2002 and 2003 (Tables 4 and 5).*** Tables 4 and 5 provide additional information on the funding of MJTFs with a focus on various fund sources. As indicated in table 4, the primary sources of funding for MJTFs are federal awards and local matches. Only one task force, the Indiana State Police Drug Task Force (ISPDTF), reported receiving funding through a state match in 2002 and 2003. Total 2002 and 2003 federal funds for the 35 MJTFs amounted to just over \$8.4 million, ranging between \$23,000 and nearly \$1.1 million. More than one-third of the cumulative federal awards for 2002 and 2003 went to the MJTFs for Lake County, the Indiana State Police, and Marion County. These three MJTFs, plus those in Floyd, Randolph, and Johnson counties, accounted for more than one-half of 2002 and 2003 federal funds spent by MJTFs. Regarding 2002 and 2003 local (or in one case, state) matches, the amounts contributed by MJTFs range between about \$8,000 to more than \$1 million, and these local contributions are anywhere from one-fifth to more than twice the federal amounts. There is clearly variation in the composition of MJTF funding streams.



**Table 3: Funds Allocated During 2002 and 2003 for Individual Task Forces <sup>1</sup>**

Task Force Name	Minimum Total Expenditure <sup>2</sup>		Total Expenditures Including Project Income <sup>3</sup>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$135,372	\$136,687	\$151,038	\$224,743
Anderson Police Department	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$106,278	\$63,665
Auburn Police Department	\$89,656	\$102,049	\$90,771	\$130,878
Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force	\$100,000	\$104,794	\$141,882	\$106,070
Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force	\$160,840	\$160,840	\$172,644	\$230,051
Clinton County Drug Task Force	\$26,232	\$29,005	\$56,623	\$29,005
Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force	\$58,056	\$59,992	\$119,531	\$59,992
Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$451,911	\$451,687	\$502,801	\$494,245
Floyd County Prosecutor	\$24,798	\$21,033	\$204,956	\$305,829
Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$211,908	\$212,432	\$211,908	\$212,432
Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	\$133,450	\$133,450	\$133,450	\$133,450
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$226,146	\$228,774	\$226,146	\$228,774
Howard County Prosecutor	\$183,860	\$189,640	\$191,967	\$198,866
Indiana State Police Drug Task Force	\$691,269	\$690,439	\$806,393	\$782,103
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	\$229,705	\$227,182	\$261,118	\$227,474
Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	\$216,217	\$228,694	\$398,662	\$338,468
Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$124,715	\$124,941	\$153,914	\$162,407
Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$553,106	\$750,646	\$793,311	\$1,100,958
LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	\$146,715	\$146,656	\$201,614	\$197,635
Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	\$905,666	\$1,009,701	\$1,080,719	\$1,045,521
Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	\$53,862	\$55,012	\$53,862	\$55,012
Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force	\$102,900	\$102,900	\$153,122	\$103,247
Peru Police Department Drug Task Force	\$21,000	\$21,346	\$44,630	\$106,278
Pulaski County Police Department	\$11,492	\$19,888	\$11,492	\$19,888
Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$238,448	\$238,517	\$256,617	\$249,220
South Central Narcotics Task Force	\$171,500	\$168,548	\$203,396	\$175,112
St. Joseph County Drug Task Force	\$182,415	\$182,415	\$209,178	\$271,826
Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force	\$29,828	\$30,060	\$124,746	\$125,060
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	\$76,576	\$76,576	\$81,232	\$138,797
Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force	\$275,072	N/R	\$275,087	N/R
Vigo County Drug Task Force	\$124,755	\$123,454	\$124,755	\$123,454
Warren County Drug Task Force	\$149,025	\$143,216	\$149,025	\$143,216
Wayne County Drug Task Force	\$95,055	\$95,000	\$102,401	\$115,777
White/Carroll County Drug Task Force	\$96,173	\$96,769	\$96,173	\$119,547
Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	\$36,640	\$36,640	\$131,695	\$36,640
Total	\$6,394,363	\$6,458,985	\$8,023,137	\$8,055,640

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 100% (35/35) reported funds allocated information for 2002, and 97% (34/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Minimum total expenditures consist of federal grants and state, and local matches spent.

<sup>3</sup> Total expenditure including project income consists of federal, state, and local matches spent and project income expended. This may include some double counting as the project income expenditure could have been used as a local match.





**Table 4: Federal, Local, and Minimum Total Expenditures**

Task Force Name	Federal Award Spent		Local Match Spent		Minimum Total Expenditure	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department	\$83,044	\$83,044	\$52,328	\$53,643	\$135,372	\$136,687
Anderson Police Department	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
Auburn Police Department	\$42,967	\$44,400	\$46,689	\$57,649	\$89,656	\$102,049
Bluffton Police Department	\$30,000	\$29,794	\$70,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$104,794
Carmel Police Department	\$112,364	\$112,364	\$48,476	\$48,476	\$160,840	\$160,840
Clinton County	\$19,674	\$21,700	\$6,558	\$7,305	\$26,232	\$29,005
Connersville Police Department	\$44,998	\$43,542	\$14,994	\$14,514	\$59,992	\$58,056
Floyd County Police Department	\$302,911	\$302,687	\$149,000	\$149,000	\$451,911	\$451,687
Floyd County Prosecutor	\$16,098	\$15,649	\$8,700	\$5,384	\$24,798	\$21,033
Grant County Police Department	\$159,212	\$159,315	\$52,696	\$53,117	\$211,908	\$212,432
Hendricks County Prosecutor	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$33,450	\$33,450	\$133,450	\$133,450
Henry County Police Department	\$75,040	\$75,040	\$151,106	\$153,734	\$226,146	\$228,774
Howard County Prosecutor	\$89,115	\$89,115	\$94,745	\$100,525	\$183,860	\$189,640
Indiana State Police <sup>2</sup>	\$518,452	\$517,830	\$172,817	\$172,610	\$691,269	\$690,439
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	\$170,655	\$168,132	\$59,050	\$59,050	\$229,705	\$227,182
Kokomo Police Department	\$73,252	\$73,250	\$142,965	\$155,444	\$216,217	\$228,694
Kosciusko County Police Department	\$93,651	\$93,704	\$31,064	\$31,237	\$124,715	\$124,941
Lake County Police Department	\$519,810	\$559,879	\$33,296	\$190,767	\$553,106	\$750,646
LaPorte County Prosecutor	\$109,973	\$109,914	\$36,742	\$36,742	\$146,715	\$146,656
Marion County Justice Agency METRO	\$445,100	\$445,100	\$460,566	\$564,601	\$905,666	\$1,009,701
Marshall County Prosecutor	\$40,397	\$41,259	\$13,466	\$13,753	\$53,862	\$55,012
Muncie Police Department	\$77,175	\$77,175	\$25,725	\$25,725	\$102,900	\$102,900
Peru Police Department	\$14,346	\$14,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$21,346	\$21,000
Pulaski County Police Department	\$8,620	\$14,917	\$2,873	\$4,971	\$11,492	\$19,888
Randolph County Police Department	\$178,871	\$178,888	\$59,577	\$59,629	\$238,448	\$238,517
South Central Narcotics Task Force	\$128,625	\$126,411	\$42,875	\$42,137	\$171,500	\$168,548
St. Joseph County	\$136,811	\$136,811	\$45,604	\$45,604	\$182,415	\$182,415
Starke County Police Department	\$14,637	\$14,751	\$15,191	\$15,309	\$29,828	\$30,060
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	\$57,432	\$57,432	\$19,144	\$19,144	\$76,576	\$76,576
Vanderburgh County	\$206,304	N/R	\$68,768	N/R	\$275,072	
Vigo County	\$93,566	\$92,591	\$31,189	\$30,864	\$124,755	\$123,454
Warren County	\$110,345	\$107,412	\$38,680	\$35,804	\$149,025	\$143,216
Wayne County	\$71,291	\$71,251	\$23,764	\$23,750	\$95,055	\$95,000
White/Carroll County	\$71,173	\$71,769	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$96,173	\$96,769
Whitley County Prosecutor	\$27,480	\$27,480	\$9,160	\$9,160	\$36,640	\$36,640
Total	\$4,288,388	\$4,121,606	\$2,108,257	\$2,335,097	\$6,396,645	\$6,456,703

<sup>1</sup> For Indiana State Police, the "local match" is actually considered a "state match." It was the only state match reported by any of the MJTFs.



Table 5: Fund Breakdown by Source of Funds 2002 and 2003 <sup>1</sup>

Task Force Name	Forfeitures Obtained Within Project Period		Other Income Obtained Within Project Period		Project Income Expended Within Project Period	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department	\$30,122	\$7,919	\$48,273	\$4,181	\$91,663	\$31,896
Anderson Police Department	\$49,243	\$6,096	\$2,967	\$5,202	\$6,564	\$15,666
Auburn Police Department	\$44,710	\$34,380	\$45,089	\$11,330	\$88,056	\$46,278
Bluffton Police Department	\$0	\$0	\$926	\$186	\$3,665	\$1,115
Carmel Police Department	\$4,865	\$12,407	\$59,941	\$67,224	\$28,829	\$41,882
Clinton County	\$0	\$6,874	\$7,250	\$10,850	\$30,391	\$17,245
Connersville Police Department	\$0	\$0	\$1,886	\$6,153	\$1,276	\$11,804
Floyd County Police Department	\$25,073	\$55,613	\$1,354	\$360	\$69,211	\$61,475
Floyd County Prosecutor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Grant County Police Department	\$0	\$3,662	\$51,197	\$37,827	\$50,891	\$42,558
Hendricks County Prosecutor	\$263,060	\$311,900	\$4,816	\$7,910	\$180,157	\$284,796
Henry County Police Department	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Howard County Prosecutor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indiana State Police	\$9,099	\$75,836	\$2,809	\$13,614	\$115,124	\$62,221
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Kokomo Police Department	\$20,000	\$0	\$4,110	\$4,829	\$8,107	\$9,226
Kosciusko County Police Department	\$0	\$5,745	\$6,198	\$5,056	\$31,412	\$292
Lake County Police Department	\$24,619	\$30,731	\$16,267	\$5,925	\$182,445	\$109,774
LaPorte County Prosecutor	\$14,453	\$13,573	\$20,500	\$30,085	\$29,199	\$37,466
Marion County\Justice Agency METRO	\$111,366	\$219,036	\$15,600	\$0	\$240,205	\$350,311
Marshall County Prosecutor	\$0	\$0	\$74,894	\$90,870	\$54,899	\$50,979
Muncie Police Department	\$93,495	\$58,601	\$67,953	\$1,833	\$175,053	\$35,820
Peru Police Department	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pulaski County Police Department	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Randolph County Police Department	\$10,619	\$6,163	\$0	\$642	\$50,222	\$347
South Central Narcotics Task Force	\$11,129	\$9,428	\$984	\$4,655	\$20,777	\$22,777
St. Joseph County	\$31,472	\$48,109	\$0	\$0	\$23,630	\$84,932
Starke County Police Department	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	\$3,579	\$17,823	\$17,000	\$3,261	\$18,169	\$10,703
Vanderburgh County	\$0	N/R	\$0	N/R	\$26,763	N/R
Vigo County	\$54,455	\$30,936	\$18,991	\$85,734	\$89,411	\$94,918
Warren County	\$79	\$0	\$0	\$1,380	\$0	\$15
Wayne County	\$0	\$0	\$46,500	\$71,500	\$95,055	\$95,000
White/Carroll County	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Whitley County Prosecutor	\$0	\$0	\$3,520	\$2,810	\$4,656	\$7,346
Total	\$801,439	\$954,832	\$519,024	\$473,416	\$1,715,831	\$1,526,842

<sup>1</sup> Eight task forces did not submit information on beginning and ending project balances, forfeitures and seizures obtained within project period, or income expended during project period.

Another source of variation in MJTF funding sources is asset forfeiture proceeds (Table 5). Task forces reported the values of the assets forfeited during project periods. In terms of forfeiture totals for the two year period, three task forces reported total forfeiture values between \$1,000 and \$10,000, six between



\$10,001 and \$35,000, and eight between \$35,001 and \$100,000. In addition, three task forces—Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force, Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force, Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force—reported total forfeiture values in excess of \$100,000. More detail on asset seizures and the proceeds from asset forfeitures is provided in Tables 17 and 18.

Finally, in terms of project income expended within project period, four task forces reported expenditures during the two year period between \$1,000 and \$20,000, six between \$20,001 and \$50,000, four between \$50,001 and \$100,000, and eight between \$100,001 and \$200,000. In addition, four task forces—Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force, Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force, Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force, and Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force—reported expenditures in excess of \$200,000—with Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force reporting the greatest expenditure total at \$590,516.

## **MJTF production during the 2002 and 2003 periods**

Based on the review of ICJI's archive of MJTF performance reports, the production by individual task force operations can be characterized in several different ways. Individual offenders can be arrested. Cases against suspected offenders can be built and sent to prosecutors. From this, convictions can be obtained. In addition, illegal drugs can be seized. Drug laboratories or production facilities can be dismantled. Finally, assets held by offenders can be seized, and ultimately forfeited through sale or auction. The following tables characterize these various production measures for the 35 Indiana MJTFs during 2002 and 2003.

***Drugs of primary focus as identified by task forces (Table 6).*** In addition to the quantitative information referenced above, task forces were also asked to report their drugs of primary focus in 2002 and 2003. These are described in Table 6.

## **Arrests, convictions, and cases**

One function of MJTFs is to arrest drug offenders, build cases against them, and transfer the cases to state or federal prosecutors. It should be noted in the following tables that comparisons between arrests and convictions are difficult to make because double counting of arrests and convictions likely occurred as persons arrested and convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were arrested and convicted. In addition, arrests in one year are unlikely to correspond with convictions in that year (or even the next) because many arrests will not generate cases that come to trial in the same year. Of course, this also means that one year's convictions are not necessarily related to that same year's arrests.



**Table 6: Drugs of Primary Focus as Identified by Task Forces**

Task Force Name	Drugs of Primary Focus	
	2002	2003
Indiana State Police	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine	
South Central Narcotics	crack cocaine, heroin, MDMA, methamphetamine, powder cocaine, oxycontin	crack cocaine, heroin, MDMA, methamphetamine, powder cocaine, oxycontin
Allen County Police Department	cocaine, crack, marijuana	cocaine and marijuana
Anderson Police Department	crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine labs, opiate patches, prescription drugs	all; cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, narcotics
Auburn Police Department	cocaine, LSD, marijuana, methamphetamine	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine
Bluffton Police Department	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescrip. pills
Carmel Police Department	MDMA, methamphetamine, powder cocaine	methamphetamine and powder cocaine
Connersville Police Department	crack cocaine, methamphetamine, oxycontin	crack cocaine, methamphetamine, oxycontin
Floyd County Police Department	cocaine, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals	cocaine, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals
Floyd County Prosecutor		cocaine, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals
Grant County Police Department		cocaine, crack cocaine, powder cocaine, marijuana
Hendricks County Prosecutor	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine
Henry County Police Department	prescription medication	cocaine, prescription drugs
Howard County Prosecutor	cocaine	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine
Johnson County Drug/Gang		cocaine, heroin, marijuana, methamphetamine
Kokomo Police Department	crack cocaine and methamphetamine	cocaine and meth
Kosciusko County Police Department	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine
Lake County Police Department	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana	cocaine, crack, marijuana
LaPorte County Prosecutor	club drugs, cocaine, marijuana, schedule II substances	cocaine, marijuana, Schedule II substances
Marion County Justice Agency METRO	club drugs, cocaine, methamphetamine	
Marshall County Prosecutor	cocaine, crystal methamphetamine, marijuana	cocaine, crystal methamphetamine, marijuana
Muncie Police Department	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, oxycontin	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine
Peru Police Department	methamphetamine	methamphetamine
Pulaski County Police Department		
Randolph County Police Department	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, pills	cocaine, methamphetamine, pills
St. Joseph County	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana	cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana
Starke County Police Department	marijuana, methamphetamine, oxycodone	marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	methamphetamine	methamphetamine
Vanderburgh County	club drugs, cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine,	club drugs, cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine,
Vigo County	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs	cocaine and methamphetamine
Wayne County		crack cocaine, fraud, powder cocaine, scheduled drugs
Warren County		cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription drugs
Whitley County Prosecutor	marijuana, MDMA, methamphetamine, pharmaceuticals	
Clinton County	marijuana and methamphetamine	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine
White/Carroll County	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine	cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, prescription pills

Note:

- 1) Of the 35 task forces, 83 percent (29/35) reported drugs of primary focus in 2002 and 91 percent (33/35) reported this information in 2003.



**Total arrests and convictions by type of offense (Table 7).** Reports filed with ICJI indicate that reporting MJTFs made nearly 14,000 arrests in 2002 and 2003. During this same two-year period, there were just under 4,200 convictions. However, these are likely undercounts due to incomplete reporting. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002, and 91 percent (32/35) reported this information for 2003. In addition, 69 percent (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74 percent (26/35) reported this information for 2003. Arrest and convictions were separated into six different offense types-- Manufacturing/Cultivating, Importing/Transporting, Distributing/Selling, Buying, Possession/Using/Consuming, and Other. Of these offense types during the two year period, Possession/Using/Consuming accounted for the greatest number of arrests at 7,776, followed by Distributing/Selling (4,708), Manufacturing/Cultivating (741), Other (350), Buying (212), and Importing/Transporting (50). In terms of convictions, the ordering for the greatest frequency of offense types was the same as for arrests with Possession/Using/Consuming accounting for the greatest number of convictions at 2,236, followed by Distributing/Selling (1,482), Manufacturing/Cultivating (216), Other (154), Buying (64), and Importing/Transporting (35).

**Table 7: Total Arrests and Convictions by Type of Offense**<sup>1,2</sup>

Type of Offense	Arrests			Convictions		
	2002	2003	Total Arrests	2002	2003	Total Convictions
Possession/Using/Consuming	3,566	4,210	7,776	1,096	1,140	2,236
Distributing/Selling	2,379	2,329	4,708	662	820	1,482
Manufacturing/Cultivating	310	431	741	66	150	216
Other	64	286	350	38	116	154
Buying	153	59	212	21	43	64
Importing/Transporting	27	23	50	25	10	35
Total	6,499	7,338	13,837	1,908	2,279	4,187

Double counting of arrests and convictions likely occurred because persons arrested and convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were arrested and convicted.

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002, and 91% (32/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 69% (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74% (26/35) reported this information for 2003.

**Total number of persons arrested by demographic characteristics (Table 8 and Table 9).** Demographic information on arrests was available for gender, race, and age of arrestees, although again there is not complete reporting. Of the 35 task forces, 83 percent (29/35) reported arrest information by demographics for 2002 and 89 percent (31/35) reported this information for 2003. In terms of gender, males accounted for 77 percent of total arrestees and females accounted for 19 percent. The comparatively large “unclassified” designation followed from one task force’s bracketing of responses and represented 5 percent of arrestees. In terms of race, whites accounted for the greatest number of arrests with 61 percent, followed by blacks (26 percent), Hispanics (5 percent), and other (2 percent). Similar to gender, “unclassified” accounted for 6 percent of arrestees. In terms of age, 92 percent of arrestees were 18 years or older.



Table 8 offers different detail on the demographic characteristics of arrestees, by excluding the “unclassified” arrestees. The typical arrestee was a white, adult male. Fewer than 4.0 percent of arrestees were juvenile.

**Table 8: Total Number of Persons Arrested by Demographics <sup>1</sup>**

	Total Arrests			
Gender	2002	2003	Total	Percentage
Female	1,046	1,146	2,192	19%
Male	4,303	4,708	9,011	77%
Unclassified	-	533	533	5%
Total	5,349	6,387	11,736	100%
	Total Arrests			
Race	2002	2003	Total	Percentage
Black American	1,215	1,799	3,014	26%
Hispanic	236	340	576	5%
Other	171	71	242	2%
White	3,554	3,646	7,200	61%
Unclassified	173	531	704	6%
Total	5,349	6,387	11,736	100%
	Total Arrests			
Age	2002	2003	Total	Percentage
17 or younger	183	240	423	4%
18 or older	5,166	5,617	10,783	92%
Unclassified	-	530	530	5%
Total	5,349	6,387	11,736	100%

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 83% (29/35) reported arrest information by demographics for 2002, and 89% (31/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> One task force submitted bracketed totals for some information. This information represents the unclassified values.



**Table 9: Total Number of Persons Arrested in 2002 and 2003, by Demographic Characteristics**

	Gender				
	Male		Female		Total
	Under 18 years	18 years or older	Under 18 years	18 years or older	
Race					
Black American	98	2,394	4	380	2,876
Hispanic	28	513	4	34	579
Other	0	206	0	33	239
White	228	5,399	71	1,635	7,333
Subtotal, classified	354	8,512	79	2,082	11,027
Unclassified					709
Total					11,736
As percent of persons arrested					
Black American	0.8%	20.4%	0.0%	3.2%	24.5%
Hispanic	0.2%	4.4%	0.0%	0.3%	4.9%
Other	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.3%	2.0%
White	1.9%	46.0%	0.6%	13.9%	62.5%
Subtotal, classified	3.0%	72.5%	0.7%	17.7%	94.0%
Unclassified					6.0%
Total					100.0%

Note: The majority of the Unclassified arrests were defined as such because they were not entered according to race, sex, or age of the arrestee. Rather, these entries represented the reporting method of one of the task forces and their use of bracketed responses. The remaining Unclassified arrests were the result of the absence/failure to report on one of the three demographic characteristics of arrestees.

**Number of arrests by offense type by MJTF by year (Table 10).** The number of arrests by offense type was dominated by possession and distribution. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002 and 91 percent (32/35) reported this information for 2003. Of the five offense types, Possessing/Using/ Consuming accounted for the greatest number of arrests over the two year period with 7,776. This was followed by Distributing/Selling (4,708), Manufacturing/Cultivating (741), Other (350), Buying (212), and Importing/Transporting (50). The number of arrests in Table 9 exceeds the number of persons arrested because persons arrested for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were required by the ICJI questionnaire to be counted for each category for which they were arrested.

**Number of convictions by offense type by MJTF by year (Table 11).** The patterns of convictions generally followed that of arrests during 2002 and 2003. Of the 35 task forces, 69 percent (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74 percent (26/35) reported this information for 2003. As with arrests by offense type, convictions were separated into five offense types. Of these offense types, Possessing/Using/Consuming accounted for the greatest number of convictions over the two year period with 2,236 followed by Distributing/Selling (1,482), Manufacturing/Cultivating (216), Other (154), buying (64), and Importing/Transporting (33). Again, double counting of convictions likely occurred here because persons convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were required to be counted for each category for which they were convicted.



**Table 10: Number of Arrests by Offense Type by MJTF by Year<sup>1</sup>**

Task Force Name	Manufacturing, Cultivating		Importing, Transporting		Distributing, Selling		Buying		Possession, Using, Consuming		Other		Annual subtotals		Grand Total
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	
Allen County Police Department	0	8	0	0	19	21	0	0	95	155	0	0	114	184	298
Anderson Police Department	5	1	0	0	48	81	6	12	91	97	0	0	150	191	341
Auburn Police Department	16	40	0	0	69	60	0	0	9	12	0	0	94	112	206
Bluffton Police Department	0	0	0	0	11	12	0	0	20	49	0	0	31	61	92
Carmel Police Department	2	12	0	0	82	132	0	2	60	72	16	25	160	243	403
Clinton County	0	3	0	0	6	10	0	7	19	23	0	0	25	43	68
Connersville Police Department	1	3	0	0	24	49	0	1	289	437	2	10	316	500	816
Floyd County Police Department	17	71	0	0	75	103	0	0	15	150	0	0	107	324	431
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	35	N/R	0	N/R	47	N/R	0	N/R	103	N/R	0	N/R	185	185
Grant County Police Department	0	0	3	0	36	59	0	0	15	53	0	12	54	124	178
Hendricks County Prosecutor	9	8	0	0	38	90	0	0	40	119	0	0	87	217	304
Henry County Police Department	0	0	8	0	49	15	0	17	167	1	0	3	224	36	260
Howard County Prosecutor	22	0	3	0	157	119	140	0	172	347	6	0	500	466	966
Indiana State Police	30	48	0	0	330	107	1	0	111	47	8	19	480	221	701
Johnson County	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Kokomo Police Department	1	25	0	0	108	10	0	0	107	39	0	0	216	74	290
Kosciusko County Police Department	0	0	0	0	37	124	0	0	11	0	0	0	48	124	172
Lake County Police Department	0	1	4	4	11	40	0	0	108	168	0	0	123	213	336
LaPorte County Prosecutor	4	2	0	0	117	53	0	0	67	39	0	0	188	94	282
Marion County Justice Agency METRO	1	3	1	9	61	64	0	2	21	14	0	2	84	94	178
Marshall County Prosecutor	15	9	0	0	101	33	0	0	147	73	0	2	263	117	380
Muncie Police Department	0	0	0	10	37	29	0	16	33	81	0	0	70	136	206
Peru Police Department	0	24	5	0	5	0	0	0	6	27	0	0	16	51	67
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Department	0	1	0	0	49	69	0	0	7	31	0	0	56	101	157
South Central Narcotics Task Force	3	14	3	0	96	151	0	0	114	148	8	0	224	313	537
St. Joseph County	0	0	0	0	68	130	0	0	853	1078	0	0	921	1208	2,129
Starke County Police Department	27	36	0	0	11	3	0	0	31	32	5	0	74	71	145
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	0	4	0	0	123	144	3	2	60	95	0	14	186	259	445
Vanderburgh County	103	32	0	0	308	318	0	0	634	548	0	187	1045	1085	2,130
Vigo County	33	34	0	0	252	115	0	0	211	93	19	12	515	254	769
Warren County	N/R	7	N/R	0	N/R	43	N/R	0	N/R	2	N/R	0	N/R	52	52
Wayne County	N/R	3	N/R	0	N/R	77	N/R	0	N/R	65	N/R	0	N/R	145	145
White/Carroll County	21	7	0	0	5	21	2	0	41	12	0	0	69	40	109
Whitley County Prosecutor	0	N/R	0	N/R	46	N/R	1	N/R	12	N/R	0	N/R	59	N/R	59
Total	310	431	27	23	2,379	2,329	153	59	3,566	4,210	64	286	6,499	7,338	13,837

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported arrests by offense type in 2002, and 91% (32/35) reported this information for 2003.

N/R represents task forces not reporting information for arrests by offense type.

Double counting of arrests likely occurred as persons arrested for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were arrested.





Table 11: Number of Convictions by Offense Type by MJTF by Year <sup>1</sup>

	Manufacturing, Cultivating		Importing, Transporting		Distributing, Selling		Buying		Possession, Using, Consuming		Other		Annual Subtotals		Grand Total
Task Force Name	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	
Allen County Police Department	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	28	71	0	0	33	75	108
Anderson Police Department	1	4	0	0	94	82	19	10	114	48	0	0	228	144	372
Auburn Police Department	12	18	0	0	53	53	0	0	6	7	0	0	71	78	149
Bluffton Police Department	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	15	13	0	0	17	20	37
Carmel Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Clinton County	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	6	12	0	0	7	18	25
Connersville Police Department	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	55	73	1	0	58	75	133
Floyd County Police Department	0	12	0	1	25	36	0	11	11	72	0	0	36	132	168
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	14	N/R	11	N/R	54	N/R	0	N/R	79	79
Grant County Police Department	0	2	0	0	39	10	0	0	109	14	12	2	160	28	188
Hendricks County Prosecutor	5	11	0	0	12	29	0	0	9	22	0	0	26	62	88
Henry County Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	35	6	0	0	35	8	43
Howard County Prosecutor	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	36	22	0	0	51	22	73
Indiana State Police	2	3	4	3	34	76	0	1	4	13	0	6	44	102	146
Johnson County Drug/Gang	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Kokomo Police Department	N/R	24	N/R	0	N/R	3	N/R	0	N/R	12	N/R	0	N/R	39	39
Kosciusko County Police Dept.	0	0	11	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	17
Lake County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
LaPorte County Prosecutor	0	0	0	0	20	48	0	0	19	14	0	0	39	62	101
Marion Co. Justice Agency METRO	1	0	0	0	38	4	0	0	7	2	0	0	46	6	52
Marshall County Prosecutor	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	7	11	0	1	8	16	24
Muncie Police Department	0	N/R	0	N/R	16	N/R	0	N/R	35	N/R	0	N/R	51	N/R	51
Peru Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Dept.	0	0	0	0	16	25	0	0	10	24	0	0	26	49	75
South Central Narcotics Task Force	3	4	10	0	44	73	0	0	69	84	5	10	131	171	302
St. Joseph County	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Starke County Police Department	0	33	0	3	5	15	0	0	5	8	0	0	10	59	69
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	3	0	0	0	77	107	1	6	70	87	0	9	151	209	360
Vanderburgh County	24	14	0	0	108	115	0	0	296	385	0	88	428	602	1030
Vigo County	15	22	0	0	34	42	0	0	150	61	20	0	219	125	344
Warren County	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	42	N/R	0	N/R	4	N/R	0	N/R	46	46
Wayne County	N/R	1	N/R	1	N/R	19	N/R	2	N/R	21	N/R	0	N/R	44	44
White/Carroll County	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Whitley County Prosecutor	0	N/R	0	N/R	21	N/R	1	N/R	0	N/R	0	N/R	22	N/R	22
Total	66	150	25	8	662	820	21	43	1096	1140	38	116	1908	2277	4185

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 69% (24/35) reported convictions by offense type in 2002, and 74% (26/35) reported this information for 2003.

N/R represents task forces not reporting information for convictions by offense type.

Double counting of convictions likely occurred as persons convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense were asked to be counted for each category for which they were convicted.



**Total drug arrests by type of drug by year (Table 12).** Regardless of the type of offense involved (e.g., possession, distribution, etc.), different drugs can be involved. ICJI reporting requirements call for information regarding the types of drugs generating arrest activity. In this regard, marijuana forms the bulk of drug arrests, although there are significant quantities of other drugs driving arrests as well. Of the 35 task forces, 83 percent (29/35) reported drug arrests by type of drug for 2002 and 89 percent (31/35) reported this information for 2003. To streamline reporting, drug arrests were combined by Center researchers into three categories: marijuana, cocaine, and other. Other drug arrests consist of club drugs, depressants, inhalants, hallucinogens, hashish, opiates/narcotics, stimulants (which includes methamphetamines), and other drugs. In terms of the distribution of drug arrests by category, 39 percent were for marijuana, 26 percent were for cocaine, and 35 percent were for other in 2002. In 2003, marijuana accounted for 37 percent of drug arrests, cocaine 27 percent, and other 36 percent.

**Total case investigations and outcomes (Table 13).** Another measure included in MJTF reports to ICJI is the number of case investigations produced by task force operations. This measure is broken down further into new cases and (old) cases carried over to the new reporting year. Case status is additionally classified in terms of the number referred for prosecution and the number of cases that are simply discontinued. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported investigations initiated and completed information for 2002 and 94 percent (33/35) reported this information for 2003. Cases were assigned to three different categories—new cases, cases carried over (from previous reporting period or previous year), and case outcomes (referred for prosecution and discontinued cases). In excess of 7,000 new cases were initiated annually in both 2002 and 2003. Moreover, a substantial number were referred for prosecution. However, any comparisons based on these “total case investigations” data should be conducted with caution.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 12: Total Drug Arrests by Type of Drug by Year <sup>1</sup>**

Type of Drug	2002	Percentage	2003	Percentage
Marijuana	2,069	39%	2,367	37%
Cocaine	1,406	26%	1,722	27%
Other	1,874	35%	2,298	36%
Total	5,349	100%	6,387	100%

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 83% (29/35) reported drug arrests by type of drug for 2002, and 89% (31/35) reported this information for 2003.

When entering arrest data, it was noted that the conviction data was incomplete because task forces claimed that conviction data was maintained by the prosecutor's office. Similarly, three of the task forces (Floyd County Prosecutor, Howard County Prosecutor, Marshall Pulaski County Police Department) claim to be part of other task forces which suggests that there may be some overlap in the information they provided.

<sup>3</sup> One limitation of the information contained in this table relates to cases carried over. Of the 35 task forces, only 14 accurately carried over cases from the previous reporting period (within the same year) in 2002 and 11 in 2003. In addition, only 9 task forces accurately carried over cases from the previous year in 2002 and 0 in 2003. Accuracy was obtained if, after reviewing the reports, the "number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period" matched the "number of cases carried over into next reporting period" from the previous report.



**Table 13: Total Case Investigations and Outcomes<sup>1</sup>**

Case Status	2002	2003
Number of New Cases	7,149	8,003
Number of Cases Carried Over <sup>2</sup>	6,515	8,583
	Case Outcomes <sup>3</sup>	
Case Status	2002	2003
Number Referred for Prosecution	4,400	5,768
Number Discontinued	1,746	1,719
Total	6,146	7,487

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported investigations initiated and completed information for 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Cases Carried Over—Of the 35 Task Forces, 14 accurately carried over cases from the previous reporting period (within the same year) in 2002 and 11 in 2003. In addition, 9 task forces accurately carried over cases from the previous year in 2002 and 0 in 2003. Accuracy was obtained if, after reviewing the reports, the "number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period" matched the "number of cases carried over into next reporting period" from the previous report.

<sup>3</sup> "Number of referred" cases are those that have been referred for prosecution. "Number of discontinued" cases are cases for which investigation was discontinued and no prosecution is anticipated. The combination of these case outcomes (referred and discontinued) comprises the total number of case outcomes.

**Number of cases carried over, new cases, and cases completed by MJTF by year (Table 14).** There is considerable variation in the number of cases initiated and carried over during 2002 and 2003 when the focus shifts to individual MJTF operations. Of the 35 task forces, 89 percent (31/35) reported the number of cases carried over in 2002 and 94 percent (33/35) reported this information for 2003. In addition, of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported the number of new cases in 2002, and 94 percent (33/35) reported this information in 2003. The category, "Case outcomes," is a count of the number of cases referred for prosecution and the number of cases dismissed for a reporting period. As mentioned above in Table 12, a limitation of the information contained in this table relates to cases carried over (see footnote 3). New cases in 2002 or 2003 range from a low of 10 to a high of 1,753. Meanwhile, there is a regular and substantial backlog of cases carried over from the previous period.

### Drugs seized and methamphetamine labs dismantled

The MJTFs seize drugs when offenders are arrested (or even if they are not arrested) for drug violations. In addition, drug manufacturing or processing facilities are typically dismantled or otherwise destroyed when they are uncovered. Both of these activities are reported by MJTFs as part of the ICJI reporting questionnaire.



**Table 14: Number of Cases Carried Over, New Cases, and Cases Completed by MJTF by Year <sup>1</sup>**

Task Force Name	Cases Carried Over From Previous Period <sup>2</sup>		New Cases		Case Outcomes <sup>3</sup>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Allen County Police Department	327	157	183	189	246	193
Anderson Police Department	1,031	965	149	168	142	388
Auburn Police Department	66	102	128	137	122	128
Bluffton Police Department	42	82	26	72	12	46
Carmel Police Department	40	52	170	245	147	215
Clinton County	16	6	10	24	3	17
Connersville Police Department	124	256	106	70	41	16
Floyd County Police Department	63	186	74	388	60	389
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	77	N/R	188	N/R	164
Grant County Police Department	26	52	68	130	2	91
Hendricks County Prosecutor	117	111	77	196	117	140
Henry County Police Department	75	59	216	120	119	54
Howard County Prosecutor	600	1,659	380	494	380	494
Indiana State Police	2,750	3,660	679	679	356	536
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	30	12	60	142	70	120
Kokomo Police Department	30	12	129	123	135	76
Kosciusko County Police Department	0	29	116	194	77	174
Lake County Police Department	6	24	245	321	227	317
LaPorte County Prosecutor	97	50	543	200	521	153
Marion County Justice Agency METRO	315	263	114	93	139	137
Marshall County Prosecutor	0	1	180	82	163	90
Muncie Police Department	23	57	84	94	84	72
Peru Police Department	10	16	15	33	20	16
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Department	41	0	218	95	215	63
South Central Narcotics Task Force	201	340	356	380	247	318
St. Joseph County	19	36	1,428	1,753	1,392	1,734
Starke County Police Department	12	47	30	52	62	128
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	261	28	189	149	0	0
Vanderburgh County	172	172	752	595	647	651
Vigo County	0	0	283	272	283	272
Warren County	N/R	35	N/R	99	N/R	102
Wayne County	N/R	17	N/R	189	N/R	156
White/Carroll County	0	20	58	37	50	37
Whitley County Prosecutor	21	N/R	83	N/R	67	N/R
Total	6,515	8,583	7,149	8,003	6,146	7,487

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 89% (31/35) reported the number of cases carried over in 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information in 2003. In addition, of the 35 task forces, 86% (31/35) reported the number of new cases in 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information in 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Cases Carried Over—Of the 35 task forces, 14 accurately carried over cases from the *previous reporting period* (within the same year) in 2002 and 11 in 2003. In addition, 9 task forces accurately carried over cases from the *previous year* in 2002 and 0 in 2003. Accuracy was obtained if, after reviewing the reports, the "number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period" matched the "number of cases carried over into next reporting period" from the previous report.

<sup>3</sup> Case Outcomes include the number of cases referred for prosecution and the number of cases dismissed for a reporting period.



***Total quantities of drug seizures by type of drug by year (Table 15).*** A prime activity of all MJTFs is the seizure of illegal drugs. Of the 35 task forces, 86 percent (30/35) reported drug seizure information for 2002 and 94 percent reported this information for 2003. The measurement of drug seizures is not straightforward. One consideration is the type of drugs seized, which can of course vary, and another is what unit of measurement to use to quantify the volume of the seizure. To that end, drug seizures were assigned to one of ten different drug types—club drugs, depressants, cocaine, hallucinogens, hashish, marijuana, opiates/narcotics, other, paraphernalia, and stimulants—and were quantified according to four different units of measurement—dosage units, kilograms, plants, and other.<sup>4</sup>

Because of differences in the units of measurement, comparisons of drug seizure quantities are difficult. For example, considering the “dosage units” measure, the greatest amount of seizures during the 2002–2003 period was the “other” category,” which accounted for 41 percent of total dosage units seized followed by depressants (17 percent), opiates/narcotics (15 percent), club drugs (11 percent), and stimulants (11 percent).<sup>5</sup> Within stimulants, methamphetamines comprised 96 percent of the dosage units seized. In terms of kilograms of drugs seized (and plants), marijuana represented the greatest seizure amount. Cocaine and stimulants each represented 3 percent of the kilograms seized with methamphetamine comprising 30 percent of the total stimulants. Marijuana accounted for 99 percent of the plant seizures while hallucinogens and other represented the remaining 1 percent. In terms of seizures listed by other unit of measurement, other represented 51 percent of the total seizures followed by depressants (23 percent), opiates/narcotics (18 percent), and paraphernalia (7 percent). Hallucinogens, marijuana, and stimulants comprised the remaining 1 percent.

***Total number of methamphetamine (meth) labs dismantled (Tables 16, 16a, and 16b).*** The MJTFs reported the number of meth labs that were dismantled each year. However, less than three-quarters of the MJTFs reported lab information. Of the 35 task forces, 71 percent (25/35) reported methamphetamine labs dismantled information for 2002, and 71 percent (25/35) reported this information for 2003. For Table 16, drug labs dismantled are divided into two categories—labs dismantled by the ISP and drug labs dismantled excluding the ISP. This was done because the ISP assists many of the task forces in dismantling labs. Approximately 1,910 meth labs were dismantled in the two years surveyed here. In total, this is likely to be an undercount of total meth labs dismantled because of the substantial underreporting of this question by the MJTFs. Furthermore, there is substantial variation in the number and types of meth labs dismantled among reporting MJTFs (see Table 16a and 16b). Three MJTFs account for the lion’s share of lab activity during the 2002 and 2003 operating periods. These are Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force (221), Vigo County Drug Task Force (249), and South Central Narcotics Strike Force (211).

Most meth labs dismantled were classified as “Nazi-Type” as shown in Table 16b. The individual MJTFs reported that of the 1,213 labs dismantled, ISP assistance was used 742 times.

---

<sup>4</sup> In addition, several MJTF performance reports documented seizures of various drugs in pounds or ounces. These were all converted to kilograms to maintain a consistent reporting standard.

<sup>5</sup> The other category includes the following: Anabolic-Androgenic Steroids, Antidepressants, Paraphernalia, and Other drug (specify)



**Table 15: Total Quantities of Drug Seizures by Type of Drug by Year <sup>1</sup>**

Type of Drug	Unit of Measurement							
	Dosage Units		Kilograms		Plants		Other	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Club Drugs	7,138	8,057	0	1	0	0	0	0
Depressants	13,425	9,271	1	0	0	0	520	430
Cocaine	0	18	139	267	0	0	0	0
Hallucinogens	293	4,885	11	4	13	22	0	34
Hashish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marijuana	118	4	7,405	3,514	1,291	2,574	0	2
Opiates/Narcotics	7,194	13,176	1	2	0	0	107	645
Other	46,921	9,512	11	200	0	15	1,997	158
Paraphernalia	0	0	0	5	0	0	174	111
Stimulants	72	628	73	164	0	0	25	0
Methamphetamine	77	14,756	32	65	0	0	0	0
Total	75,238	60,306	7,673	4,223	1,304	2,611	2,823	1,380

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 86% (30/35) reported drug seizure information for 2002, and 94% (33/35) reported this information for 2003.

**Table 16: Total Number of Meth Labs Dismantled <sup>1</sup>**

	2002	2003	Totals
Drug Labs Dismantled (excluding ISP)	460	753	1,213
ISP Labs Dismantled <sup>2,3</sup>	697	N/R	697
Total	1,157	753	1,910

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 71% (25/35) reported meth labs dismantled information for 2002, and 71% (25/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> ISP is included separately because they assist other task forces in dismantling meth labs which results in overlapping of information.

<sup>3</sup> The ISP included attachments to their performance reports outlining their activities related to the dismantling of meth labs. The attachment for the first six month report was undated while the second six month report specified the time period when the labs were dismantled. Notably, there is some overlap between the reports for the month of September. In addition, March is omitted from the specified dates for 2002.



**Table 16a: Number of Meth Labs Dismantled by MJTF by Year <sup>1</sup>**

<b>Task Force Name</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	N/R <sup>3</sup>	N/R	0
Anderson Police Department	4	7	11
Auburn Police Department	31	34	65
Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force	2	N/R	2
Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force	4	5	9
Clinton County Drug Task Force	4	6	10
Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force	2	3	5
Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force	13	79	92
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	33	33
Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force	N/R	4	4
Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	2	4	6
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	N/R	1
Howard County Prosecutor	N/R	34	34
Indiana State Police Drug Task Force <sup>2</sup>	697	N/R	697
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	N/R	2	2
Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	19	20	39
Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	5	17	22
Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	N/R	1
LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	1	N/R	1
Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	1	N/R	1
Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	14	19	33
Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force	1	6	7
Peru Police Department Drug Task Force	5	51	56
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	0
Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force	1	2	3
South Central Narcotics Task Force	83	128	211
St. Joseph County Drug Task Force	N/R	N/R	0
Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force	10	28	38
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	25	7	32
Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force	114	107	221
Vigo County Drug Task Force	107	142	249
Warren County Drug Task Force	N/R	5	5
Wayne County Drug Task Force	N/R	1	1
White/Carroll County Drug Task Force	10	9	19
Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	N/R	N/R	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,157</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>1,910</b>
<b>Net of ISP reporting</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>1,213</b>

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 Task Forces, 71% (25/35) reported labs dismantled information for 2002, and 71% (25/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> The Indiana State Police assists nearly all counties in the dismantling of meth labs. As such, there is significant overlap between the ISP figures and other task forces.

<sup>3</sup> N/R represents no information reported on task forces dismantled.

<sup>4</sup> This figure does not include labs dismantled by ISP in 2003 (ISP dismantled labs statistics not reported by ISP in 2003).



Table 16b: Number of Meth labs Dismantled by MJTF, by Year, and with Indiana State Police Assistance

Task Force Name	Red Phosphorous				Nazi-Type				Methamphetamine				Methcathanon				Totals			
	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used
Allen County Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anderson Police Department	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	0
Auburn Police Department	1	0	0	0	30	30	25	16	0	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	31	30	34	23
Bluffton Police Department	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Carmel Police Department	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	1	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	5
Clinton County	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	6
Connersville Police Department	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	3
Floyd County Police Department	12	6	58	8	1	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	79	8
Floyd County Prosecutor	0	0	22	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0
Grant County Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Hendricks County Prosecutor	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4
Henry County Police Department	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Howard County Prosecutor	0	0	2	2	0	0	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	34
Indiana State Police <sup>2</sup>	48	0	0	0	624	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	682	0	0	0
Johnson County Drug/Gang	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
Kokomo Police Department	0	0	2	0	19	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	20	0
Kosciusko County Police Department	0	0	0	0	5	5	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	17	17
Lake County Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
LaPorte County Prosecutor	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Marion Co. Justice Agency METRO	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Marshall County Prosecutor	0	0	0	0	14	14	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	19	19
Muncie Police Department	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	6
Peru Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	5	5	29	25	0	0	0	0	5	5	51	25
Pulaski County Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Randolph County Police Department	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
South Central Narcotics	2	2	2	0	20	18	90	86	52	50	27	22	9	9	9	9	83	79	128	117
St. Joseph County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Starke County Police Dept.	0	0	0	0	10	4	28	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	28	12
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	3	3	0	0	22	15	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	18	7	5
Vanderburgh County	0	0	0	0	114	0	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	0	107	0
Vigo County	0	0	0	0	107	107	142	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	107	142	117





Table 16b: Number of Meth Labs Dismantled by MJTF, by Year, and with Indiana State Police Assistance (continued)

Task Force Name	Red Phosphorous				Nazi-Type				Methamphetamine				Methcathanon				Totals			
	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used	2002	ISP Used	2003	ISP Used
Warren County	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Wayne County	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
White/Carroll County	0	0	0	0	10	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	9	9
Whitley County Prosecutor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	74	19	90	14	991	235	584	342	58	56	70	58	19	9	9	9	1142	319	753	423

Note: ISP reported an additional 15 labs which they classified as other. These labs are not represented in the table.



## Assets seized and forfeited

As noted in an earlier section, drug arrests often result in the seizure of assets held by offenders, followed by the forfeiture via sale or auction of some or all of the assets previously seized.<sup>6</sup> The Indiana MJTFs are required to report on the numbers of different types of assets seized, an estimate of their individual values, and the amount of funds obtained from the forfeiture of the assets. In comparing assets and forfeitures, at least two factors should be considered. First, comparisons between the number of seizures and the estimated value of seizures should be made with caution as there is not always a number of seizures to correspond with a value. Second, comparisons between seizures and forfeitures should be made with caution as the information on forfeitures could be carried over from previous reporting periods as a result of the time it takes to process seizures and convert them into forfeitures.

***Assets seized and forfeited and values by asset category by year (Table 17).*** As with other report questions, there is incomplete reporting of this item. Of the 35 task forces, 74 percent (26/35) reported assets seized information for 2002 and 83 percent (29/35) reported this information for 2003. Assets seized and forfeited were combined into five main types—financial, other, property, transport, and weapons. In terms of the number of seizures for the two years, weapons seizures were the greatest with 66 percent of the total, followed by other (20 percent), transport (10 percent), and property and financial (4 percent). In terms of the number of forfeitures, “other” forfeitures were the greatest with 58 percent of the total, followed by transport (16 percent), weapons (13 percent), and financial and property (13 percent).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> When the police arrest someone for an offense for which asset seizure is possible and assets are in fact seized, the police agency can then file a lawsuit in civil court to be given permission for asset forfeiture. Forfeitures can occur at variable periods after the assets have been seized. Certain assets might be held for months or years, possibly because criminal and civil proceedings are delayed. In any given year, there is no certainty at all that forfeitures will equal asset seizures—there might in fact be very little correlation between assets seized in a given year and assets forfeited that same year.

<sup>7</sup> Based on the ICJI questionnaire, it is unclear whether “number of seizures” refers to the number of seizure events (e.g., in 1148 seizures in 2002, weapons were seized 700 times) or the number of items seized (e.g., 700 weapons were seized in 2002).



**Table 17: Total Number of Assets Seized and Forfeited and Values by Asset Category by Year <sup>1</sup>**

Asset Type	Number of Seizures <sup>2</sup>		Estimated Value of Seizures		Number of Forfeitures <sup>3</sup>		Actual Value of Forfeitures	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Financial	21	43	\$2,147,862	\$3,368,958	20	21	\$1,057,996	\$1,610,881
Other	207	496	\$106,470	\$109,585	410	24	\$11,000	\$15,626
Property	100	9	\$54,270	\$321,750	56	4	\$57,600	\$236,315
Transport	120	242	\$644,365	\$1,414,758	84	36	\$291,823	\$489,030
Weapons	700	1673	\$57,135	\$343,365	39	59	\$5,550	\$19,225
Unclassified			\$21,000				\$600	\$800
Total	1148	2446	\$3,031,102	\$5,558,416	609	144	\$1,424,569	\$2,371,876

<sup>1</sup> Completion rate: of the 35 task forces, 74% (26/35) reported assets seized information for 2002, and 83% (29/35) reported this information for 2003. Of the 35 task forces, 66% (23/35) reported estimated value of assets information for 2002, and 77% (27/35) reported this information for 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Comparisons between the number of seizures and the estimated value of seizures should be made with caution as there is not always a number of seizures to correspond with a value.

<sup>3</sup> Comparisons between seizures and forfeitures should be made with caution as the information on forfeitures could be carried over from previous reporting periods as a result of the time it takes to process seizures.

<sup>4</sup> Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force submitted bracketed totals for some information. This information represents the unclassified values.

This translates into dollar terms in two ways—as an early estimate of the value of assets seized, and as the money actually obtained through the forfeiture process. For purposes of financing future MJTF operations, it is the volume of forfeitures that are perhaps most important, because these funds can be captured by the individual MJTF and used as a source of program income. In this context, the reporting MJTFs acquired approximately \$3.8 million during 2002 and 2003 from asset forfeitures. Again, this is a likely undercount of total funds from asset forfeitures, largely due to reporting shortfalls.

**Number and value of assets seized and forfeited by MJTF by year (Table 18).** There is substantial variation in seizure and forfeiture activity among the MJTFs. Of the 35 task forces, 66 percent (23/35) reported estimated value of assets information for 2002, and 77 percent (27/35) reported this information for 2003. In terms of the combined seizure values for both years, five task forces reported estimated seizure values between \$1000 and \$10,000, seven between \$10,001 and \$50,000, five between \$50,001 and \$150,000, seven between \$150,001 and \$300,000, and three between \$300,001 and \$1 million. In addition, three task forces—Indiana State Police Drug Task Force, Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force and Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force—reported estimated seizure values in excess of \$1 million—with Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force reporting the greatest estimated value at \$1,533,550.

However, total seizure values do not necessarily translate into forfeiture values. In terms of the combined forfeiture values for both years, four task forces reported total forfeiture values between \$1,000 and \$10,000, nine between \$10,001 and \$50,000, three between \$50,001 and \$150,000, and three between \$150,001 and \$300,000. In addition, five task forces—Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force, Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force, Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force, Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force, Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force—reported total forfeiture values in excess of \$300,001—with Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force reporting the greatest estimated value at \$765,500.



**Table 18: Number and Value of Assets Seized and Forfeited by MJTF by Year**

Task Force Name	Assets Seized Values			Forfeitures Values		
	2002	2003	Total	2002	2003	Total
Allen County Police Department	\$109,239	\$352,096	\$461,335	\$566,932	\$99,031	\$665,964
Anderson Police Department	\$92,000	\$138,160	\$230,160	\$30,942	\$19,098	\$50,040
Auburn Police Department	\$14,800	\$500	\$15,300	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bluffton Police Department	N/R	\$100	\$100	N/R	\$0	\$0
Carmel Police Department	\$90,717	\$58,463	\$149,180	\$52,044	\$81,950	\$133,994
Clinton County	\$6,950	\$11,000	\$17,950	\$650	\$6,000	\$6,650
Connersville Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Floyd County Police Department	\$16,813	\$73,764	\$90,577	\$0	\$27,205	\$27,205
Floyd County Prosecutor	N/R	\$32,704	\$32,704	N/R	\$0	\$0
Grant County Police Department	\$17,045	\$18,590	\$35,635	\$6,651	\$13,861	\$20,512
Hendricks County Prosecutor	\$14,000	\$202,200	\$216,200	\$116,790	\$257,615	\$374,405
Henry County Police Department	\$4,650	\$2,000	\$6,650	\$0	\$0	\$0
Howard County Prosecutor	\$20,453	\$22,840	\$43,293	\$3,960	\$17,702	\$21,662
Indiana State Police	\$293,461	\$897,148	\$1,190,609	\$0	\$0	\$0
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	N/R	\$886,531	\$886,531	N/R	\$765,500	\$765,500
Kokomo Police Department	\$68,398	\$66,251	\$134,649	\$22,493	\$3,414	\$25,906
Kosciusko County Police Department	\$8,967	\$157,330	\$166,297	\$4,952	\$28,852	\$33,804
Lake County Police Department	\$658,035	\$580,727	\$1,238,762	\$8,602	\$433,764	\$442,366
LaPorte County Prosecutor	\$57,148	\$2,007	\$59,155	\$0	\$0	\$0
Marion County Justice Agency METRO	\$593,270	\$940,280	\$1,533,550	\$273,036	\$124,825	\$397,861
Marshall County Prosecutor	\$1,000	N/R	\$1,000	\$0	N/R	\$0
Muncie Police Department	\$94,853	\$26,101	\$120,954	\$117,445	\$67,480	\$184,925
Peru Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Pulaski County Police Department	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Randolph County Police Department	\$0	\$1,350	\$1,350	\$6,295	\$6,122	\$12,417
South Central Narcotics Task Force	\$184,952	\$109,600	\$294,552	\$38,668	\$36,400	\$75,068
St. Joseph County	\$112,000	\$150,000	\$262,000	\$0	\$47,000	\$47,000
Starke County Police Department	\$100	\$14,389	\$14,489	\$500	\$14,389	\$14,889
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor	\$9,362	\$153,624	\$162,986	\$0	\$8,415	\$8,415
Vanderburgh County	\$481,493	\$490,640	\$972,133	\$110,870	\$136,519	\$247,389
Vigo County	\$80,396	\$145,454	\$225,850	\$62,740	\$163,311	\$226,051
Warren County	N/R	\$1,425	\$1,425	N/R	\$1,425	\$1,425
Wayne County	N/R	\$23,143	\$23,143	N/R	\$12,000	\$12,000
White/Carroll County	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Whitley County Prosecutor	\$1,000	N/R	\$1,000	\$1,000	N/R	\$1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,030,102</b>	<b>\$5,533,848</b>	<b>\$8,563,950</b>	<b>\$1,423,569</b>	<b>\$2,358,452</b>	<b>\$3,782,021</b>

**Notes:**

- 1) Comparisons between seizures and forfeitures should be made with caution as the information on forfeitures could be carried over from previous reporting periods as a result of the time it takes to process seizures. In addition, many task forces did not report a corresponding forfeiture value, or, conversely, a corresponding seizure value.
- 2) Of the 35 task forces, eight did not include a corresponding forfeiture value in 2002 and six did not include this figure in 2003.





# Appendix 1

## Multi-jurisdictional

### Task Forces in Indiana, 2002-2003





## Indiana Drug Task Force Supported by Byrne Formula Grant Funds in FY 2002-2003

Task Force	Jurisdictions Covered by Task Force
Allen County Police Department Drug Task Force	Allen, Huntington Counties; Cities of Fort Wayne and Huntington
Anderson Police Department	Madison County; City of Anderson
Auburn Police Department	Noble, LaGrange, DeKalb, Steuben Counties
Bluffton Police Department Drug Task Force	Wells County; City of Bluffton
Carmel Police Department Drug Task Force	Hamilton, Boone Counties; Cities of Carmel, Zionsville and Lebanon
Clinton County Drug Task Force	Clinton County
Connersville Police Department Drug Task Force	Fayette, Shelby, Rush, Decatur Counties; Cities of Connersville and Shelbyville
Floyd County Police Department Drug Task Force	Floyd, Harrison, Clark Counties; Towns of New Albany, Clarksville and Scottsburg
Floyd County Prosecutor	Assigned to Southeast Indiana Drug Task Force out of the Floyd County Police Department
Grant County Police Department Drug Task Force	Grant, Marion Counties
Hendricks County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Hendricks, Putnam Counties; Towns of Brownsburg and Plainfield
Henry County Police Department Drug Task Force	Henry County; Towns of New Castle, Middletown, Sulphur Springs, Spiceland and Knightstown
Howard County Prosecutor	Part of Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force
Indiana State Police Drug Task Force	Statewide
Johnson County Drug/Gang Task Force	Marion, Johnson Counties
Kokomo Police Department Drug Task Force	Howard County; City of Kokomo
Kosciusko County Police Department Drug Task Force	Kosciusko County; City of Warsaw
Lake County Police Department Drug Task Force	Lake County; Cities of Cedar Lake, Crown Point, Dyer, East Chicago, Lowell, Merrillville, Munster, New Chicago, Schererville and St. John
LaPorte County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	LaPorte County; Cities of LaPorte and Michigan City, Towns of Long Beach, Trail Creek and Kingsford Heights
Marion County Justice Agency METRO Drug Task Force	Marion, Hamilton Counties; City of Indianapolis and Marion County Police Departments
Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Marshall, Fulton, Pulaski Counties; City of Plymouth
Muncie Police Department Drug Task Force	Delaware County; City of Muncie
Peru Police Department Drug Task Force	Miami County; City of Peru
Pulaski County Police Department	Part of Marshall County Prosecutor Drug Task Force
Randolph County Police Department Drug Task Force	Randolph, Jay Counties; Indiana State Police
South Central Narcotics Strike Force	Monroe, Brown, Sullivan, Lawrence, Greene Counties
St. Joseph County Drug Task Force	St. Joseph County; Cities of South Bend and Mishawaka
Starke County Police Department Drug Task Force	Starke County; Town of Knox
Tippecanoe County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Tippecanoe County; City of Lafayette
Vanderburgh County Drug Task Force	Vanderburgh, Warrick Counties
Vigo County Drug Task Force	Vigo County; City of Terre Haute
Warren County Drug Task Force	Warren, Benton, Fountain, Vermilion Counties
Wayne County Drug Task Force	Wayne County; City of Richmond
White Carroll County Drug Task Force	White and Carroll Counties
Whitley County Prosecutor Drug Task Force	Whitley County; Town of Columbia City







# Appendix 2

## Multi-jurisdictional

### Drug Task Force Performance Report Form

**INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE  
DRUG AND CRIME CONTROL DIVISION**

**Multijurisdictional Drug Task Force Performance Report Form**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

The basis of reporting for this report form is Drug Task Force activities in the current reporting period. Before additional funds can be released, the form must be completed and returned within 20 days of the end of the reporting period (see question 4 below) to:

Attn: Grant Manager  
Drug and Crime Control Division  
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute  
One North Capitol, Suite 1000  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2038

Tel: (317) 232-1230  
Fax: (317) 232-4979

This report form replaces any previous forms you have used to submit drug task force information to the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute. As this new form is tested and piloted, changes to further simplify and clarify the form may be made on next year's form. Thus, we do not recommend major modifications to your internal tracking systems or agency databases at this time.

**REPORT INFORMATION**

1 Current Grant Number: _____	<i>For CJI use only</i> Federal Grant No.: _____
2 Name of Task Force: _____	
3 Current Project Period:      Begin Date ____ / ____ / ____      End Date ____ / ____ / ____	
4 Performance Report Covering: <input type="checkbox"/> 04/01 to 09/30 <input type="checkbox"/> 10/01 to 03/31 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	
5 Date Report Was Completed: ____ / ____ / ____	

	<i>Task Force Coordinator</i>	<i>Person Completing Report Form</i>
6 Name:	_____	_____
7 Agency:	_____	_____
8 Address:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
9 Telephone:	_____	_____
10 Email Address:	_____	_____
11 Fax Number:	_____	_____

## TASK FORCE PERSONNEL AND COORDINATION

- 12 In the table below, indicate the total number of people who worked with or assisted your drug task force during the current reporting period. For each row category, enter the total number of individuals who dedicated 100% (all) of their work time and the total number who dedicated less than 100% of their work time to task force activities, separately for grant-funded and non-grant-funded personnel.

		No. Who Dedicated 100% of Their Time	No. Who Dedicated <i>Less Than</i> 100% of Their Time
Law Enforcement Officers (investigative and uniformed)	Grant-Funded		
	Non-Grant-Funded		
Prosecution Staff	Grant-Funded		
	Non-Grant-Funded		
Legal Staff (legal interns, paralegals, etc.)	Grant-Funded		
	Non-Grant-Funded		
Financial or Other Specialists (specify type):	Grant-Funded		
	Non-Grant-Funded		
Administrative/Support Staff:	Grant-Funded		
	Non-Grant-Funded		

- 13 For each law enforcement officer who worked with your task force during the current reporting period, place a checkmark in the appropriate column to indicate whether the officer was (a) a member of your agency and funded by Byrne drug task force funds, (b) a member of your agency but not funded by Byrne drug task force funds, or (c) a member of another agency. If the officer worked on a drug task force at the other agency, enter the name of the drug task force in the space provided. In the last column, indicate the percent of each officer's total time that was dedicated to your task force activities during the current reporting period.

	Member of Your Agency		Member of Another Agency	Name of Other Agency Drug Task Force	% Time on Your Task Force Activities
	Funded by Byrne Drug Task Force Funds	<u>Not</u> funded by Byrne Drug Task Force Funds			
Officer 1					
Officer 2					
Officer 3					
Officer 4					
Officer 5					
Officer 6					
Officer 7					
Officer 8					
Officer 9					
Officer 10					
Officer 11					
Officer 12					
Officer 13					
Officer 14					
Officer 15					

- 14 Indicate whether your task force worked with any of the following agencies during the current reporting period by placing checkmarks in the appropriate boxes below (leave blank if none).

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local agencies (of any type) | <input type="checkbox"/> IRS                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State agencies (of any type) | <input type="checkbox"/> LECC                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ATF                          | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Attorney          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coast Guard                  | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Customs           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DEA                          | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Marshals Service  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FAA                          | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Postal Service    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FBI                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> INS                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |

- 15 Being as specific as possible, please indicated any changes in your task force's jurisdictional boundaries during the current reporting period (enter "none" if there were no changes): \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

## CASE INVESTIGATIONS AND OUTCOMES

- 16 *Using the following definitions*, please provide information about task force case investigations and case outcomes for the current reporting period only (enter 0 for an item if none).

Cases are investigations involving one or more suspects for which a case number has been assigned.

Discontinued cases are cases for which investigation was discontinued and no prosecution is anticipated.

Referred cases are cases that have been referred for prosecution.

- A Number of cases carried over from the previous reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_
- B Number of new cases investigated: \_\_\_\_\_
- C Total number of cases (Add items A and B): \_\_\_\_\_
- D Number of discontinued cases: \_\_\_\_\_
- E Number of referred cases: \_\_\_\_\_
- F Number of cases carried over into next reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Subtract items D and E from item C. Enter the result here  
and on line 16A of your next performance report.)

## DRUGS SEIZED AND PURCHASED

- 17 Which drugs were the primary focus of your task force operations during the current reporting period:

---

---

- 18 Of the total number of cases reported in question 16 line C, how many cases resulted in drugs being seized during the current reporting period (enter 0 if none): \_\_\_\_\_

Total quantity of drugs seized by your task force during the current reporting period (leave blank if none):  
(Specify quantity and the unit of measurement when the "Other" category is used.)

		Grams	Kilograms	Ounces	Pounds	Dosage Units	Plants	Other
Club Drugs	GHB/GBL							
	Ketamine							
	MDMA (Ecstasy)/MDA							
	Rohypnol							
	Other Club Drugs							
	Specify:							
Coke	Specify:							
	Powder Cocaine							
	Rock/Crack Cocaine							
CNS Depressants	Mebaral							
	Nembutal							
	Other Barbiturates							
	Specify:							
	Specify:							
	Halcion							
	Librium							
	ProSom							
	Valium							
	Xanax							
	Other Benzodiazepines							
	Specify:							
	Specify:							
	Inhalants	Gases						
Nitrates								
Solvents								
Other Inhalants								
Specify:								
Specify:								
Hallucinogens	LSD							
	Mescaline or Peyote							
	PCP (Phencyclidine)							
	Psylocybin							
	Other Hallucinogens							
	Specify:							
	Specify:							
	Hashish							
	Marijuana							

19 continued -- Total quantity of drugs seized by your task force during the current reporting period (leave blank if none): (Specify quantity and the unit of measurement when the "Other" category is used.)

		Grams	Kilograms	Ounces	Pounds	Dosage Units	Plants	Other
Opiates/Narcotics	Codeine							
	Darvon							
	Demerol							
	Dilaudid							
	Heroin							
	Hydrocodone or Percodan							
	Methadone							
	Morphine							
	Opium							
	Oxycontin							
	Vicodin							
	Other Opiates/Narcotics							
	Specify:							
	Specify:							
Stimulants	Amphetamines							
	Dexedrine							
	Methamphetamine							
	Methylphenidate (Ritalin)							
	Other Stimulants							
	Specify:							
Other	Specify:							
	Anabolic-Androgenic Steroids							
	Antidepressants							
	Paraphernalia							
	Other Drug (specify):							
	Other Drug (specify):							
Other Drug (specify):								

- 20 Using the most appropriate measure (kilograms, etc.), enter the total quantity of marijuana destroyed with the assistance of your task force during the current reporting period (leave blank if none). In the last column, circle yes or no to indicate whether the Indiana National Guard helped destroy the marijuana.

	Kilograms	Pounds	Ounces	Grams	Plants	National Guard Assisted?	
Wild (Ditchweed)						Yes	No
Cultivated						Yes	No
Hydroponics (Growing Operation)						Yes	No
Sinsemilla (Seedless)						Yes	No

- 21 List each county in which the following types of labs were dismantled by your task force during the current reporting period and the number of labs that were dismantled in each county (leave blank if none). Then circle small (less than 6 ounces), medium (6 ounces to 2 pounds), or large (more than 2 pounds) to indicate the production size of the lab(s). In the last column, circle yes or no to indicate whether Indiana State Police Clandestine Lab Units were used to help dismantle the lab(s).

	County	# of Labs	Size of Lab			ISP Unit Used?	
Red phosphorous meth labs:			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
Nazi-type meth labs:			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
Methamphetamine box labs:			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
Methcathanon labs			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No
“ “			Small	Medium	Large	Yes	No



## ASSETS SEIZED AND FORFEITED

- 22 Of the total number of cases reported in question 16 line C, how many cases resulted in *asset seizures* during the current reporting period (enter 0 if none): \_\_\_\_\_
- 23 Of the total number of cases reported in question 16 line C, how many cases resulted in *asset forfeitures* during the current reporting period (enter 0 if none): \_\_\_\_\_

24 Number and monetary value of assets seized or forfeited by your task force during the current reporting period (leave blank if none). Include both voluntary and court-ordered forfeitures.

		SEIZURES		FORFEITURES	
Asset Type	No.	Estimated Value	No.	Actual Value	
Currency		\$		\$	
Other Financial Instruments (stocks, bonds, etc.)		\$		\$	
Real Property		\$		\$	
Personal Property (jewelry, stamps, coins, etc.)		\$		\$	
Electronics (televisions, stereos, etc.)		\$		\$	
Motor Vehicles		\$		\$	
Watercraft		\$		\$	
Aircraft		\$		\$	
Weapons	Handguns/Revolvers	\$		\$	
	Semi-Automatic Handguns	\$		\$	
	Rifles	\$		\$	
	Semi-Automatic Rifles	\$		\$	
	Shotguns	\$		\$	
	Semi-Automatic Shotguns	\$		\$	
	Machine Guns	\$		\$	
	Knives/Cutting Devices	\$		\$	
	Explosive Devices	\$		\$	
	Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Weapons	\$		\$	
	Other Weapon (specify):	\$		\$	
	Other Weapon (specify):	\$		\$	
	Other Asset (specify):	\$		\$	
Other Asset (specify):	\$		\$		

## ARRESTS, CHARGES FILED, AND CONVICTIONS

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For this report, “arrest” refers to the formal filing of criminal charges against a suspected offender. Summonses issued or persons held temporarily for investigation should not be counted, nor should persons picked up on escape or violation warrants unless new drug charges are also filed. “Charges” refer to people referred for prosecution. “Conviction” refers to a finding of guilty (based on a jury verdict, bench trial, guilty plea, or no contest plea) for a formal criminal charge filed in a court of original jurisdiction.

The numbers reported should count total arrests during the reporting period and total convictions during the reporting period. Reported arrests and reported convictions are independent of each other. Thus, convictions for the reporting period should not be considered a subset of the number of arrests since many convictions will reflect arrests from previous reporting periods.

- 25 Enter the total number of individuals (a) arrested, (b) charged, and (c) convicted during the current reporting period as a result of your task force efforts, by type of offense (enter 0 if none):

	NO. ARRESTED		NO. CHARGED		NO. CONVICTED	
Type of Offender	Violent	Non-Violent	Violent	Non-Violent	Violent	Non-Violent
Drug offenses only						
Non-drug offenses only						
Both drug and non-drug offenses						
Total number of individuals						

- 26 **ARRESTS:** In Column A, enter the number of people arrested during the current reporting period as a result of your task force efforts -- by age, sex, race, and drug type (leave blank if none). **Persons arrested for more than one type of drug offense should be counted in each drug category for which they were arrested.**

**CONVICTIONS:** In Column B, enter the number of people convicted during the current reporting period as a result of your task force efforts -- by age, sex, race, and drug type (leave blank if none). **Persons convicted for more than one type of drug offense should be counted in each drug category for which they were convicted.**

	A NO. ARRESTED BY AGE		B NO. CONVICTED BY AGE	
	17 or Younger	18 or Older	17 or Younger	18 or Older
<b>CLUB DRUGS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>COCAINE</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				

	A		B	
	NO. ARRESTED BY AGE		NO. CONVICTED BY AGE	
	17 or Younger	18 or Older	17 or Younger	18 or Older
<b>CNS DEPRESSANTS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>INHALANTS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>HALLUCINOGENS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>HASHISH</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				

	A		B	
	NO. ARRESTED BY AGE		NO. CONVICTED BY AGE	
	17 or Younger	18 or Older	17 or Younger	18 or Older
<b>MARIJUANA</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>OPIATES/NARCOTICS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>STIMULANTS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<b>OTHER DRUGS</b>				
<i>Males</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				
<i>Females</i>				
Hispanic of Any Race				
African American, not Hispanic				
White, not Hispanic				
Other, not Hispanic				

27 Number of people arrested during the current reporting period as a result of your task force efforts -- by drug type and type of offense (enter 0 if none). **Persons arrested for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense should be counted in each category for which they were arrested.**

	Manufacturing/ Cultivating	Importing/ Transporting, to or within the State	Distributing/ Selling	Buying	Possession/ Using/ Consuming	Other (specify)
Club Drugs						
Cocaine						
CNS Depressants						
Inhalants						
Hallucinogens						
Hashish						
Marijuana						
Opiates/Narcotics						
Stimulants						
Other Drug (specify):						
Other Drug (specify):						
Other Drug (specify):						
Paraphernalia						

28 Number of people convicted during the current reporting period as a result of your task force efforts -- by drug type and type of offense (enter 0 if none). **Persons convicted for more than one type of drug or more than one type of offense should be counted in each category for which they were convicted.**

	Manufacturing/ Cultivating	Importing/ Transporting, to or within the State	Distributing/ Selling	Buying	Possession/ Using/ Consuming	Other (specify)
Club Drugs						
Cocaine						
CNS Depressants						
Inhalants						
Hallucinogens						
Hashish						
Marijuana						
Opiates/Narcotics						
Stimulants						
Other Drug (specify):						
Other Drug (specify):						
Other Drug (specify):						
Paraphernalia						

## ADDITIONAL TASK FORCE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- 29 Please describe any accomplishments of your drug task force during the current reporting period that were not captured in previous sections of this report. Also include any problems your task force is experiencing or any delays in implementing planned program components and attach any publications or articles related to the work of your drug task force (press releases, newspaper articles, etc.).